

R E M A R K S

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

THE CLAIMS

_____ Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the feature of the present invention whereby whether or not the second image is displayed is selectable by an operator.

In addition, claim 21 has been added to recite that the third optical system includes a movable mirror, and that moving the mirror to an evacuation position causes the second image not to be displayed.

Still further, claim 22 has been added to recite that the second image is a three-dimensionally constructed image.

The amendments to claim 1 and new claims 21 and 22 are fully supported by the disclosure in the specification at, for example, page 59, line 12 to page 62, line 16.

No new matter has been added, and it is respectfully requested that the amendment to claim 1 and the addition of claims 21 and 22 be approved and entered.

THE PRIOR ART REJECTION

Claims 1-7 and 9 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious in view of the combination of JP 10-333047 (previously

cited "Morita") and USP 4,786,154 (newly cited "Fantone et al"), and claim 8 was rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious in view of the combination of Morita and Fantone et al with USP 5,704,897 (previously cited "Truppe"). These rejections, however, are respectfully traversed with respect to the claims as amended hereinabove.

On page 5 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that Morita does not disclose two display systems and two optical systems arranged on optical axes of second and third optical systems, respectively, such that correlation of display positions of the first and second images in the optical image in the field of view of the first observation device is maintained, in the manner recited in independent claim 1. For this reason, the Examiner has cited Fantone et al.

As recognized by the Examiner, Fantone et al discloses drive displays 42 corresponding to respective eyepieces 22.

It is respectfully submitted, however, that neither Morita nor Fantone et al, even taken in combination, discloses first and second displays on second and third optical systems, as recited in amended independent claim 1, wherein whether or not the second image is displayed is selectable by an operator.

Indeed, with the structure of the claimed present invention, as shown in Fig. 9, for example, two monitors 14 and 53 are provided for one eyepiece. (And as recited in claim 1, the second

and third optical systems both lead to the first optical system to display the images of the first and second displays in the field of view of the first observation device.)

By contrast, Fantone et al merely discloses a one-to-one relationship between the displays 42 and eyepieces 22.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the present invention as recited in amended independent claim 1, as well as claims 2-9 and new claims 21 and 22 depending therefrom, clearly patentably distinguishes over Morita, Fantone et al and Truppe, taken singly or in any combination consistent with the respective fair teachings thereof, under 35 USC 103.

* * * * *

Entry of this Amendment, allowance of the claims and the passing of this application to issue are respectfully solicited.

If the Examiner has any comments, questions, objections or recommendations, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned for prompt action.

Respectfully submitted,

/Douglas Holtz/

Douglas Holtz
Reg. No. 33,902

Frishauf, Holtz, Goodman & Chick, P.C.
220 Fifth Avenue - 16th Floor
New York, New York 10001-7708
Tel. No. (212) 319-4900
DH:iv
encs.